



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THREE PLANS FOR A DURABLE PEACE

BY WILLIAM I. HULL,

Professor of History and International Relations, Swarthmore College.

I believe it was Count Von Eulenburg who declared that a durable peace upon this earth is to be found only in the cemetery. But there are people, even in Germany, who do not accept that pessimistic view; and in Germany and elsewhere, all over the world, there are people who are earnestly and determinedly seeking for the proper basis of a durable peace.

As I have thought over the various plans for bringing this most desired end about, it has seemed to me that they class themselves under three headings; and, as an American, I may call these three plans, perhaps without undue conceit, the German, the Allied and the American.

The German plan of preserving a durable peace was to build up mighty armaments. "Let us have an army so invincible that no other power will dare to attack us, and we can then preserve the peace." Great Britain adopted practically the same philosophy. "Let us build up a navy so powerful that not even Germany, with its unequalled army, will dare to attack us." And so we have seen during the last generation the unprecedented building-up of armies and of navies.

That plan of preserving the peace is at present somewhat under a cloud. It is true that there are Germans who insist that they did not go far enough, that their army was not big enough; and there are Englishmen who insist that *they* did not go far enough, that their navy was not big enough, and that if they had both been larger, the peace would have been preserved. The rest of the world is very skeptical, however, of the validity of that argument. This plan of preserving the peace is not only a *big* thing in itself, but the rest of us are convinced that it carries inevitably the seeds of warfare with it.

The second plan of preserving the peace has emerged amongst the Allies. They claim that durable peace must be preserved by an alliance of the armed power, an alliance of the military forces,

of nations that are like-minded with themselves; and in this time of war they have built up these enormous and unprecedented alliances. They are looking forward, also, to the time of peace, when these alliances shall continue to coöperate, both in a military and in a commercial way.

A third plan for the preservation of peace is what I venture to call the American plan. It is a plan which rejects both the increasing armaments of the separate nations and also alliances between the armed forces of the separate nations. It is a plan which was entered upon by the thirteen independent states of our infant republic back in 1789. This plan is based not upon the optimism, the millennial optimism, that men will stop quarreling with one another, but upon the determination that when quarrels arise between states as between citizens, they shall be settled not by military force but by judicial process.

We, in America, have put that experiment into operation. We have found that it works. The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 represent the first attempt to give to the rest of the world the American plan of preserving a durable peace. The Hague Conferences, in the endorsement of international arbitration and in the establishment of the permanent Court of Arbitration, took the first step in the application of that American program for the rest of the world; and the world is looking forward to the time when the forty-six nations in the family of nations shall settle their international differences and disputes as regularly and as inevitably by judicial process, as the forty-eight states of our union settle interstate disputes.

Now, what is the supreme difficulty in the realization of this American program? Some have thought that it is the difficulty of getting disputes before the arbitral tribunal, and the League to Enforce Peace has made it its object to compel by economic and, if necessary, by military pressure, the bringing of disputes before the international tribunal. Some think that the supreme difficulty is to get the awards of the court accepted. This has not proven the case, however, as far as experience shows; for out of about two hundred and forty-three disputes settled by arbitration since 1794, not a single one of the decisions of the tribunals has been resisted.

Are there, then, already in existence sanctions sufficient to

bring disputes before the court and to have the decisions of the court accepted when they are handed down? It would certainly seem that there are, in view of the fact that more than twelve score have been accepted. Among these forces is, first, diplomacy,—an international diplomacy. I fear that too many,—that the ninety-nine, perhaps, of every hundred American citizens who are demanding that in case Germany does not yield to the demands of the United States, diplomatic relations shall be broken,—do not really understand what is meant by the breaking of diplomatic negotiations. I cannot analyze this great power of our time, but can merely remark that if diplomatic pressure can be made almost world-wide instead of being exercised by one nation only, as would be the case of the United States against Germany, the diplomatic power alone is of enormous strength.

Secondly, the commercial and financial sanction, to which I can only allude at this time; and thirdly, the great power of public opinion,—both national public opinion and international public opinion. Lord Bryce, in his *American Commonwealth*, has revealed to us Americans the tremendous, the *sovereign* power of public opinion within our own country. There is a public opinion in every country. It is that great, unorganized sovereignty to which President MacCracken referred, and it has been appealed to scores of times, as I have indicated, and has never yet failed. If that public opinion within each nation and between the nations can be thoroughly organized, it will form the third of these twentieth century sanctions.

Then, fourthly, we are told that force is always behind the law. Yes, that is true; but it is a long way behind the law in civilized communities. It is the ultimate sanction of law; and how many thousands of disputes are settled through legal process by no more physical force than is represented by the exertion of the judge who presides in pronouncing the decision?

It is undoubtedly the last resort; yes, but what kind of force is it? Is it merely military power? Would this international police force towards which we are looking represent the military power of each nation? Would it represent the allied military powers of a few nations? Not if it is a genuine police force.

This leads me to say that I devoutly hope that that element of the League to Enforce Peace which stands for a genuine interna-

tional police force will triumph within that organization, that it will triumph over that other element of the League to Enforce Peace, which insists that the military force represented by a partial alliance of national armaments shall be the sanction, and that this military force shall be placed in the forefront of the program.

On the other hand, there has existed in this country ever since the second Hague Conference, and long before the "frightfulness" of the present war caused the League to Enforce Peace and the plans for an Anglo-American or Pan-American offensive and defensive alliance to spring into existence, an organization which stands absolutely upon the judicial basis for the settlement of international disputes. This organization, the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, believes explicitly that when the right kind of a court can be organized, and when the diplomatic, economic and public opinion sanctions can be organized and placed behind that court, international disputes will come naturally and invariably before it, and the awards of the court in those disputes will be accepted as regularly and naturally as are the awards of the Supreme Court of the United States. This society stands also upon the proposition that if force is ever used, even as the ultimate sanction, it shall be, not national armaments, and not an alliance of national armaments, but a genuine *police* power.

Now, that is the road, also, that has been taken by the Central Organization for a Durable Peace. Its program was launched at The Hague, it is true; but it is the old, historic program of the United States of America; and this Organization for a Durable Peace, and the Hague Conferences of the future, are going to work steadfastly along the American pathway to complete, world-wide and permanent success.